

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and allow claims 1-13, 16 and 17, new claims 68 to 91, as well as withdrawn claims 35-41 and 43-59, the only claims pending and currently under examination in this application following entry of the above amendments.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the claimed device is dimensioned for placement into an optical scanner. Support for this amendment, as well as for new claims 68 to 79, is found in the specification at page 9, paragraphs 30 and 31. New claims 77-82 find support in paragraph 32, as well as in the remaining claims. New claims 83-90 find support in paragraphs 30 and 31, and the remaining claims. Finally, new claim 91 finds support throughout the specification, e.g., paragraph 49 and the following paragraphs. As such, no new matter has been added and entry of the above amendments and new claims is therefore respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for the interview held on February 25, 2004. During the interview, the above amendments were discussed and found by the Examiner to overcome the rejections of record. The Examiner also indicated that the withdrawn method claims would be rejoined and allowed. The Examiner also indicated that the newly presented claims which incorporate the limitation of claim 1 would also be allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 1-13, 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over either Adler or Cole. All of the pending claims now require the device to be dimensioned for placement into an optical scanner. This element is not present in either Adler or Cole because the devices described in these references are not for placement into an optical scanner. Instead, the Adler device is a sensor device and the Cole device is directed to an interconnect structure for use in electronic applications, both of which devices are not employed in an array scanner. As such, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the claimed calibration device and this rejection may be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in good and proper form for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issuance.

If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at the number provided. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1078.

Respectfully submitted,

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP

Date: 3-18-04

By: _____

Bret Field
Registration No. 37, 620

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP
200 Middlefield Road, Suite 200
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Telephone: (650) 327-3400
Facsimile: (650) 327-3231